



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,181	02/12/2002	Hal Hildebrand	2222.5390002	8962
26111	7590	01/27/2010		
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER	
			BATES, KEVIN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/27/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/076,181	Applicant(s) HILDEBRAND ET AL.
	Examiner KEVIN BATES	Art Unit 2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 10-27 and 29-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 10-27 and 29-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on June 5, 2009.

Claims 1-9 and 28 have been cancelled.

Claims 10-27 and 29-35 are currently amended.

Claims 10-27 and 29-36 are currently pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10, 18, and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-27 and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra (5757920) in view of Davies(5682537), and in further view of Hurvig (5978802).

Regarding claims 10, 18, and 21, Misra teaches a method for providing access to a secured document, comprising:

authenticating a user having credential information to a first server at a first location (Column 7, lines 53 – 65; Column 5, lines 10 – 21) having the secured content therein; and

upon receiving a request for access for content at a second server at a second location, authenticating the credential information to the second server (Column 5, lines 10 – 21; Col. 7, lines 23-30).

Misra does not explicitly indicate that the first and second server contain the same secured document and disconnecting the user from the first server before establishing a connection that allows access to the secured document at the second server.

Davies teaches a distributed system containing a first and second server where both servers can maintain the same secured object using access locking (Col. 7, lines 34 – 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Davies teaching of multiple mirrored instances of data objects in distributed servers to allow a user of either domain to access the document from a local and secure server.

Hurvig teaches a system of maintaining locks on secure documents wherein a second user accessing the secure document requires a previously requested user to relinquish his access to the document before the second user can gain access to the document (Col. 8, lines 1 – 11; lines 50 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Hurvig's teaching of relinquishing previous user's access to a secure document in the combination of Misra and Davies to ensure that a secure document is only being modified by one person at a time even though it is distributed across multiple servers.

Regarding claims 29, 31, and 34, Misra teaches the method as recited in claims 10, 18, and 21, wherein step (a) comprises:

authenticating the credential information to the first server with respect to a previous request (Column 7, lines 53 – 65);

subsequently receiving a current access request via the second server (Column 5, lines 10 – 21); and

authenticating the credential information to the second server with respect to the current access request (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, where the user roams into a second domain, which can include using a different computer in the second domain, see Col. 7, lines 23-30).

Regarding claims 30, 32, and 35, Misra teaches the method as recited in claims 29, 31, and 34.

Misra does not explicitly indicate that wherein the method comprises:

upon receiving the current request for access via the second server, identifying a first local module previously supporting the user at the first server;

reconfiguring the first local module at the first server to remove support at the first server;

identifying a second local module to support access to the secured document at the second server; and

reconfiguring the second local module at the second server to add support for access to the secured document at the second server .

Hurvig teaches a system of maintaining locks on secure documents wherein a second user accessing the secure document requires a previously requested user to relinquish his access to the document before the second user can gain access to the document (Col. 8, lines 1 – 11; lines 50 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Hurvig's teaching of relinquishing previous user's access to a secure document in the combination of Misra and Davies to ensure that a secure document is only being modified by one person at a time even though it is distributed across multiple servers.

Regarding claims 11, 22, and 25, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 10, 31, and 21, wherein authenticating the user having credential information comprises authenticating both the credential information and a client machine being (Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 9).

Regarding claims 12 and 26, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 29 and 21, wherein the first and the second servers are access points to gain access to the secured document (Column 5, lines 10 – 14).

Regarding claims 13 and 23, Misra in combination with Davies teaches a method as recited in claims 29 and 32, wherein in response to receiving a request for access to the secured content at the first location, wherein in response to receiving a request for access to the secured content at the location location, the user interacts over a network with the second server using a second client at the second location (Misra, Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

Regarding claims 14, 20, and 27, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 30, 32, and 35, wherein said method further comprises: determining, prior to disconnecting the user from the first connection, whether the user is permitted to gain access through a second location to the secured item via the second server (Column 5, lines 10 – 16).

Regarding claim 15, Misra teaches a method as recited in claim 39, wherein said the authenticating the user with the first server occurs while the user is at a first location, and wherein receiving the access request occurs while the user is at a second location (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, wherein the system has a home location with maintains the credentials and authorization, which is then distributed through the server system).

Regarding claims 16 and 24, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 17 and 33, wherein said method further comprises:

upon receiving the current access request to access the secured item via the second server, determining permitted locations from which the user is permitted to access to the secured item;

determining, whether the second location is one of the permitted locations for the user; and

bypassing the disconnecting the user from the first connection in response to the determination that the second location is not one of the permitted locations for the user (Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

Regarding claims 17, 19, and 33, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 30, 31, and 32, wherein:

when the user is at the first location, the user interacts over a network with the first server using a first client machine at the first location, and

when the user is at the second location, the user interacts over a network with the second server using a second client machine at the second location (Column 3, line 67 – Column 4, line 7; Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 2; Column 5, lines 10 – 19, wherein the user and machine locations are roaming in the system and which ever domain the user/machine combination logs in at it connects to that domains controller which is the same location as the machine location).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN BATES whose telephone number is (571)272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KEVIN BATES/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456